

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/747,695	12/30/2003	Byung Kee Kim	1315-049	2857	
22429	7590 01/13/2006		EXAMINER		
	JPTMAN GILMAN A	WYSZOMIERSKI, GEORGE P			
1700 DIAGO SUITE 300 /3		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
ALEXANDR	IA, VA 22314	1742			
			DATE MAILED: 01/13/200	6	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary		Applica	ation No.	Applicant(s)	Applicant(s)			
		10/747	,695	KIM ET AL.	KIM ET AL.			
		Examir	ner	Art Unit				
		George	P. Wyszomierski	1742				
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communic or Reply	cation appears on	the cover sheet with	h the correspondence a	ddress			
WHIC - Exter after - If NO - Failu Any r	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAN IS IN 1967	ALING DATE OF f 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no nication. utory period will apply and ill, by statute, cause the	THIS COMMUNIC, event, however, may a regid will expire SIX (6) MONT application to become ABA	ATION.  Oly be timely filed  HS from the mailing date of this NDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	·			
Status								
1)	Responsive to communication(s) filed	on .						
•=	·	o)⊠ This action is	s non-final.					
3)	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is							
	closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.							
Dispositi	on of Claims							
4)⊠	4) Claim(s) <u>1-8</u> is/are pending in the application.							
	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.							
5)	5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.							
6)⊠	☑ Claim(s) <u>1 and 4-8</u> is/are rejected.							
7)⊠	Claim(s) 2 and 3 is/are objected to.							
8)	Claim(s) are subject to restricti	on and/or election	n requirement.					
Applicati	on Papers							
9)[	The specification is objected to by the	Examiner.						
10)⊠ The drawing(s) filed on 6/25/2004 is/are: a)⊠ accepted or b)□ objected to by the Examiner.								
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).								
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).								
11) 🗌	The oath or declaration is objected to	by the Examiner.	Note the attached	Office Action or form P	TO-152.			
Priority u	nder 35 U.S.C. § 119							
•	Acknowledgment is made of a claim fo ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:			119(a)-(d) or (f).				
	1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.							
	2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No							
	3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).							
* S	ee the attached detailed Office action		, ,,	eceived.				
			,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,					
Attachment	r(s)							
	e of References Cited (PTO-892)		4) Interview Su					
	e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PT nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or P			Mail Date  ormal Patent Application (PT	O-152)			
	No(s)/Mail Date		6) Other:					

Application/Control Number: 10/747,695 Page 2

Art Unit: 1742

1. Claim 2 is objected to because in line 3 of this claim, it appears that "hexthoxide" should read --ethoxide--.

- 2. Claims 4, 5, 7 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.
- a) The terms "said step of carburization" and "said carburized gas" in these claims lack antecedent basis. Given that no other aspect of the claimed invention relates in any way to carburizing or carburization, no reasonable determination of the scope of these claims can be made, and the prior art cannot be evaluated for whether it would or would not encompass a process within the limitations of these claims. Thus, no prior art will be applied against these claims at this time.
- b) Claims 5 and 8 recite a temperature "below zero" but give no temperature scale, e.g. Celsius, Fahrenheit. Thus, the claims are indefinite.
- 3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
  - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 4. Claims 1 and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pirzada et al. (U.S. Patent 5,788,738).

Pirzada discloses a process of producing nanoscale powders that includes obtaining a precursor of the desired material, vaporizing at least a portion of the precursor, and condensing the vaporized material to form nanoscale powders by quenching in a zone of low pressure. With respect to claim 6, the condensing is performed in an inert atmosphere such as argon or helium when metals are being produced; see Pirzada column 10, line 26.

Pirzada does not specifically disclose forming tungsten by such a process.

However, Pirzada is directed to the production of metals in general, and includes examples directed to the production of several metals as well as to tungsten oxide.

Further, Pirzada column 3, lines 33-35 indicates that prior art methods are not useful for making refractory metals, implying that the Pirzada process would be more useful in this regard. Thus, it is a reasonable assumption that the production of tungsten powder would fall within the purview of the Pirzada process. Thus, a prima facie case of obviousness is established between the disclosure of Pirzada et al. and the presently claimed invention.

5. Claims 2 and 3 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. The prior art does not disclose or suggest a process as claimed and which employs a precursor as recited in instant claim 2.

Art Unit: 1742

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to George Wyszomierski whose telephone number is (571) 272-1252. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday thru Friday from 8:00 a.m. to 4:30 p.m. Eastern time.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Roy King, can be reached on (571) 272-1244. All patent application related correspondence transmitted by facsimile must be directed to the <u>new central facsimile number</u>, (571)-273-8300. This new Central FAX Number is the result of relocating the Central FAX server to the Office's Alexandria, Virginia campus.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

GEORGE WYSZOMIERSK PRIMARY EXAMINER GROUP (1700)

GPW January 10, 2006